

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/001,257 | 11/27/2001 | Nouri E. Hakim | 4009.007.002 | 1999 |
| 75 | 05/03/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| Morris E. Cohen | | | GROSSO, HARRY A | |
| Suite 217 | | | | |
| 1122 Coney Island Avenue | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Brooklyn, NY 11230-2345 | | | 3727 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | 10/001,257 | HAKIM, NOURI E. | | | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Harry A. Grosso | 3727 | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1)[\] | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 </u> | luly 2005 | | | | |
| 2a)□ | · · | s action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowed | | secution as to the merits is | | | |
| -,_ | closed in accordance with the practice under | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) 71-121 is/are pending in the applicat | rion . | | | | |
| 7)[2] | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5)[7 | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| •— | Claim(s) 71-121 is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| - | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| • | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ | or election requirement. | | | | |
| Applicat | ion Papers | | | | | |
| | The specification is objected to by the Examin | or | | | | |
| , | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac | | Examiner. | | | |
| 10) | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | | |
| · | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | | | | | |
| 11) | The oath or declaration is objected to by the E | | | | | |
| Priority : | under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a |)-(d) or (f). | | | |
| a) | ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documer | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documer | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri | | ed in this National Stage | | | |
| | application from the International Burea | | o.d | | | |
| * (| See the attached detailed Office action for a lis | at of the centified copies not receive | ea. | | | |
| | | • | | | | |
| | • | | | | | |
| Attachmer | | , — | (PTO 412) | | | |
| | ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D | | | | |
| 3) Infor | rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date | | Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/001,257

Art Unit: 3727

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 7, 2005 has been entered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 71-121 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,357,620

Page 2

Art Unit: 3727

in view of Morano (5,542,670) or Belcastro (5,890,620). Regarding claims 71 and 82, Patent '620 discloses all of the structure except for the spout on the cap and the hole for air. The sealing member with a post is the blocking member in '620 and the anti-inversion member is the flow bridge. Morano and Belcastro disclose similar no-spill drinking apparatus with caps having a spout and a hole for air. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of a spout and a hole for air as disclosed by Morano or Belcastro in the apparatus disclosed by '620 to allow for more efficient drinking from the apparatus and passage of air through the apparatus to allow venting.

Page 3

Regarding claims 72, 76, 78-81, 83, 87, 89-92, 94, 95, 99 and 101-103, the '620 Patent as modified by Morano or Belcastro, discloses all the required structure.

The remaining claims are dependent on independent claim 71 or 82.

4. Claims 82-93, 107-109 and 116-118 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,931 in view of Morano (5,542,670) or Belcastro (5,890,620). Regarding claim 82, Patent '931 discloses all of the structure except for the spout on the cap and the hole for air. Morano and Belcastro disclose similar no-spill drinking apparatus with caps having a spout and a hole for air. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of a spout and a hole for air as disclosed by Morano or Belcastro in the apparatus disclosed by the '931 Patent to allow for more efficient drinking from the apparatus and passage of air through the apparatus to allow venting.

Art Unit: 3727

Regarding claims 83-85, 87, 89-92, 107 and 116, the '931 Patent as modified by Morano or Belcastro, discloses all the required structure.

The remaining claims are dependent on claim 82.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry A. Grosso whose telephone number is 571-272-4539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3727

hag